A Relativistic Equation-of-motion Coupled-Cluster Investigation of the Trends of Single and Double Ionization Potentials in the He and Be Isoelectronic Systems

Himadri Pathak*[1], B. K. Sahoo†[2], Turbasu Sengupta[1], B. P. Das[3], Nayana Vaval[1] and Sourav Pal[1]
[1] *Electronic Structure Theory Group, Physical Chemistry Division, CSIR-National Chemical Laboratory, Pune, 411008, India*
[2] *Theoretical Physics Division, Physical Research Laboratory, Ahmedabad-380009, India and*
[3] *Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics Group, Indian Institute of Astrophysics, Bangalore-560034, India*

arXiv:1408.0681v4 [physics.atom-ph] 10 Jan 2015

We employ four-component spinor relativistic equation-of-motion coupled-cluster (EOMCC) method within the single- and double- excitation approximation to calculate the single ionization potentials (IPs) and double ionization potentials (DIPs) of the He and Be isoelectronic sequences up to Ne. The obtained results are compared with the available results from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) database to test the performance of the EOMCC method. We also present intermediate results at different level of approximations in the EOMCC framework to gain insight of the effect of electron correlation. Furthermore, we investigate the dependence of the IPs and DIPs of these ions on the ionic charge and observe that these follow parabolic trends. Comparison between the trends of IPs and DIPs in both the classes of considered systems are categorically demonstrated.

I. INTRODUCTION

There have been significant advances in the experimental techniques in the recent years like time-of-flight photoelectron-photoelectron coincidence (TOF-PEPECO) spectroscopy [1, 2] which enables to carry out high precision measurements of multi-ionization processes stimulated by single photons from synchrotron sources. Sources like x-ray free electron laser of Linac Coherent Light sources of SLAC [3, 4] are capable of producing sequential and direct multiphoton-multielectron interactions. A single photon having sufficient energy may eject two electrons to the continuum orbitals which can be treated as a topological three-body quantal problem. The mutual interaction between the electrons (electron correlation) play a major role in these processes.

The multiply charged ions are of significant interest in diverse areas of physics, starting from the x-ray space astronomy, plasma physics to laser physics [5, 6]. In a recent work [7], it has been demonstrated that the highly charged ions of C, N, O and Ne are the constituents of warm-hot intergalactic medium and are distributed mainly between their He and H like species. These highly charged ions have significance in determining the mass of missing baryons [8, 9].

The wave function constructed using a non-relativistic theory is not adequate for the accurate description of the energy spectrum of multiply charged ions, and a relativistic description is imperative in this case [10]. On the other hand, accurate description of the relaxation effects along with the electron correlation effects are essential for explaining multiple ionization processes precisely. Therefore, calculations based on the lower order many-body theories are not reliable enough and may not be able to complement to describe the quality of results that are anticipated from the on-going sophisticated experiments [11]. Kaldor and coworkers have made significant contributions in addressing the simultaneous treatment of relativistic and electron correlation effects using coupled-cluster (CC) methods. They extended the effective Hamiltonian variant of the Fock-space multi-reference theory to the relativistic domain and applied to both atomic and molecular systems [12–17]. A brief overview of the effective Hamiltonian variant of FSMRCC is given in [18]. A detail description of the effective Hamiltonian variant of the FSMRCC can be found in Refs. [19–26]. The challenging problem associated with the effective Hamiltonian theory is the problem of intruder states which arises due to the presence of quasi-degeneracy in the eigenstates lead to the failure in convergence [27–31]. The intermediate Hamiltonian variant of the FSMRCC (IHFSMRCC) theory is a solution to address the problem of intruder states [32–39]. The eigenvalue independent partitioning technique (EIP) of Mukherjee in the multi-reference coupled-cluster (EIP-MRCC) approach is also a specific variant of IHFSMRCC to take care of the intruder state problem [40, 41]. It converts the non-linear FSMRCC equations for a given model space into a set of linear CI-like non hermitian eigenvalue equations. The solution can be reached by solving one root at a time preserving the norm of the corresponding eigenvector. This makes EIP-MRCC free from the problem of intruder and achieving faster convergence as compared to the effective Hamiltonian based FSMRCC.

On the other hand fully four-component relativistic method in the equation-of-motion coupled-cluster (EOMCC) framework [18, 42–44] is an alternative potential choice to treat different many-body effects in a balanced manner. It describes the complex multi-configurational wave function within a single reference description. The key feature of the EOMCC method is that its reference wave function is obtained using the CC

*Email: h.pathak@ncl.res.in
†Corresponding email: bijaya@prl.res.in

method, which takes care of the dynamical parts of the electron correlations while the non-dynamic counterparts are incorporated through the diagonalization of matrix elements of an effective Hamiltonian in the configuration space [45–52]. Furthermore, the EOMCC method is free from the intruder state problem due to CI like structure. This method scales properly at the non-interacting limit and does not satisfy the requirement of linkedness rigorously ensuring the size extensivity [53, 54]. It is worth to mention that EOMCC method is equivalent to effective Hamiltonian variant of the FSMRCC for the single ionization or attachment problem [55], whereas it is not so in the case of double ionization or attachment (DI/DE-EOMCC) [56–58]. The reason behind is that the FSMRCC theory requires the amplitude equations of all the lower sectors along with the amplitudes of the sector of interest, whereas EOMCC requires only the amplitudes of the (0,0) sector and that of the considered sector.

Another important aspect of EOMCC is, it directly gives the eigenstates in contrast to the propagator based approaches [59, 60] although these also have equation-of-motion (EOM) structure. Coupled cluster linear response theory (CCLRT) [61–65] is closely related to EOMCC in nature and produces identical results for the energy differences. A comparative discussion on EOMCC and CCLRT can be found in [66–68]. Choudhury *et al,* applied the relativistic CCLRT to calculate ionization potentials and related phenomena [69–74]. Symmetry adapted cluster expansion configuration interaction (SAC-CI) [75–77] is also very similar to EOMCC. These two methods differ in the description of the ground state wave-function.

In this work, we employ our recently developed fully four-component relativistic EOMCC method to calculate core as well as valence ionization potentials (IPs) and double ionization potentials (DIPs) of He-like and Be-like atomic systems with atomic number $Z \leq 10$. The results of our calculations are compared with the available results from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) database [78]. To understand the role of electron correlations, we followed different approximate schemes in the EOMCC framework. We call these as MBPT2-RPA, MBPT2-EOMCC and CCSD-RPA. In the MBPT2-RPA scheme the ground state wave-function is constructed at the first order perturbation theory level and the EOM matrix is constructed in the one-hole (1h) or two-hole (2h) space for the ionization and double ionization potential respectively. MBPT2-EOMCC uses first order perturb wave function and the EOM matrix is constructed at 1h and two-hole and one-particle (2h-1p) space for the ionization problem whereas it is 2h and 3h-1p space for the double ionization problem. The CCSD-RPA scheme uses the ground state wave-function at the coupled-cluster singles and doubles level and EOM matrix is constructed at the 1h and 2h space for single ionization and double ionization respectively. All these results are compared with the results calculated using CCSD-EOMCC method to understand passage of the electron correlation effects at various levels of approximation.

The manuscript is organized as follows: A brief discussion on the relativistic method to generate atomic single particle orbital is presented in Sec. II. This is followed by a description of the EOMCC theory in the context of evaluation of IPs and DIPs in Sec. III. We present the results and discuss about their trends in Sec. IV before making our final remarks in Sec. V. Atomic units (a.u.) is used consistently unless stated otherwise.

II. GENERATION OF BASIS AND NUCLEAR POTENTIAL

We use the Dirac-Coulomb (DC) Hamiltonian in our calculations which, after scaling with the rest mass energy of the electrons (c^2), is given by

$$H = \sum_i \left[c\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i \cdot \mathbf{p}_i + (\beta_i - 1)c^2 + V_{nuc}(r_i) + \sum_{j>i} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \right] \quad (1)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_i$ and β_i are the Dirac matrices, $V_{nuc}(r_i)$ is the nuclear potential and $\frac{1}{r_{ij}}$ is the electron-electron repulsion potential.

The four-component Dirac wave function for an electron is given by

$$|\phi(r)\rangle = \frac{1}{r} \begin{pmatrix} P(r) & \chi_{\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi) \\ iQ(r) & \chi_{-\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

with $P(r)$ and $Q(r)$ are the large and small components of the wave function and $\chi_{\pm\kappa,m}(\theta,\phi)$ are the angular functions of the relativistic quantum number $\kappa = -(j+\frac{1}{2})a$ satisfying the condition for the orbital angular momentum $l = j - \frac{a}{2}$ and total angular momentum j. Linear combination of Gaussian type of orbitals (GTOs) is used to obtain the DF single particle orbitals $|\phi_{n,\kappa}(r)\rangle$ as

$$|\phi_{n,\kappa}(r)\rangle = \frac{1}{r} \sum_\nu \begin{pmatrix} C^L_{n,\kappa} N_L f_\nu(r) & \chi_{\kappa,m} \\ iC^S_{n,-\kappa} N_S \left(\frac{1}{dr} + \frac{\kappa}{r}\right) f_\nu(r) & \chi_{-\kappa,m} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where n is the principal quantum number of the orbital, $C_{n,\kappa}$s are the expansion coefficients, $N_{L(S)}$ is the normalization constant for the large (small) component of the wave function and α_ν is a suitably chosen parameter for orbitals of different angular momentum symmetries and $f_\nu(r) = r^l e^{-\alpha_\nu r^2}$ is a GTO. The even tempering condition $\alpha_\nu = \alpha_0 \beta^{\nu-1}$ with two parameters α_0 and β used for the exponents. The small component and large component of the wave function are related through the kinetic balance condition. The two parameter Fermi-charge distribution

$$\rho_{nuc}(r) = \frac{\rho_0}{1 + e^{(r-b)/a}}, \quad (4)$$

with the normalization factor ρ_0, the half-charge radius b and $a = 2.3/4(ln3)$ is related to the skin thickness of

the atomic nucleus, is considered for the evaluation of the nuclear potential.

After obtaining the single particle orbitals, we calculate the matrix element of the Coulomb interaction operator using the expression

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\phi_a\phi_b|\frac{1}{r_{12}}|\phi_c\phi_d\rangle &= \delta(m_a-m_c,m_d-m_b)\sum_{k,q}(-1)^{m_a+m_b}\\ &\int dr_1[P_a(r_1)P_c(r_1)+Q_a(r_1)Q_c(r_1)]\\ &\times\int dr_2[P_b(r_2)P_d(r_2)+Q_b(r_2)Q_d(r_2)]\\ &\times\frac{r_<^k}{r_>^{k+1}}\times X_k\Pi(\kappa_a,\kappa_c,k)\Pi(\kappa_b,\kappa_d,k) \quad (5)\end{aligned}$$

with the multipole k determined by the triangular conditions $|j_a-j_c|\le k\le j_a+j_c$ and $|j_b-j_d|\le k\le j_b+j_d$ satisfying the condition for the function $\Pi(\kappa,\kappa',k)=\frac{1}{2}[1-aa'(-1)^{j+j'+k}]$ for $l+l'+k=$ even. The angular momentum factor X_k is given by

$$\begin{aligned}X_k &= (-1)^{q+1}\sqrt{(2j_a+1)(2j_c+1)(2j_b+1)(2j_d+1)}\\ &\begin{pmatrix} j_a & k & j_c\\ m_a & q & m_c\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} j_b & k & j_d\\ m_b & -q & m_d\end{pmatrix}\\ &\begin{pmatrix} j_a & k & j_c\\ 1/2 & 0 & -1/2\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} j_b & k & j_d\\ 1/2 & 0 & -1/2\end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

III. BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE EOMCC THEORY

In the EOMCC approach, the wave function for the k^{th} target state is created by the action of a linear operator (Ω_k) on the single reference CC wave function $|\Psi_0\rangle=\exp(\hat{T})|\Phi_0\rangle$. i.e.

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_k\rangle &= \Omega_k|\Psi_0\rangle\\ &= \Omega_k\exp(\hat{T})|\Phi_0\rangle, \quad (7)\end{aligned}$$

where $|\Phi_0\rangle$ is a reference determinant which is taken as the Dirac-Fock (DF) wave function in the present case and the CC operator $\hat{T}$ accounts for the hole (h) to particle (p) excitations. The T operators are given as

$$\hat{T}=\sum_{\substack{a<b\cdots\\ i<j\cdots}}^{N} t_{ij\ldots}^{ab\cdots}\; a^+ib^+j\ldots, \quad (8)$$

in terms of strings of creation and annihilation operators for the holes (denoted by indices i, j, $\cdots$) and particles (denoted by indices (a, b, $\cdots$) for total N number of electrons of a system. We start with the energy eigenvalue equation

$$\hat{H}\Omega_k\exp(\hat{T})|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\Omega_k\exp(\hat{T})|\Phi_0\rangle. \quad (9)$$

By operating on both the sides of the equations with $exp(-\hat{T})$ from the left-hand side and considering Ω_k and $\hat{T}$ commute each other owing to the fact that they are made up of strings of same quasi-particle creation and annihilation operators, we get

$$\bar{H}\Omega_k|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\Omega_k|\Phi_0\rangle, \quad (10)$$

for $\bar{H}\equiv exp(-\hat{T})\,\hat{H}\,exp(\hat{T})$. The above equation is projected onto the basis of excited determinants those are accessible by the action of Ω_k on $|\Phi_0\rangle$. To simplify the notations, we denote the IP evaluating EOMCC operators as

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_k^{\rm IP} &\equiv R_1+R_2+\cdots\\ &=\sum_i r_i i+\sum_{\substack{a\\ i<j}} r_{ij}^a a^+ji+\cdots, \quad (11)\end{aligned}$$

whereas for DIP evaluation, we define

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_k^{\rm DIP} &\equiv S_2+S_3+\cdots\\ &=\sum_{i<j} s_{ij}ji+\sum_{\substack{a\\ i<j<k}} s_{ijk}^a a^+kji+\cdots. \quad (12)\end{aligned}$$

We project on to the set of excited determinants ($|\Phi_i\rangle$) and ($|\Phi_{ij}^a\rangle$) representing the 1h and 2h-1p determinants, respectively, for the evaluation of the R_1 and R_2 amplitudes as

$$\langle\Phi_i|\bar{H}R_k|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\langle\Phi_i|R_k|\Phi_0\rangle \quad (13)$$

and

$$\langle\Phi_{ij}^a|\bar{H}R_k|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\langle\Phi_{ij}^a|R_k|\Phi_0\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Similarly, we project $|\Phi_{ij}\rangle$ and $|\Phi_{ijk}^a\rangle$ representing 2h and 3h-1p determinants, respectively, to determine the S_1 and S_2 amplitudes as

$$\langle\Phi_{ij}|\bar{H}S_k|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\langle\Phi_{ij}|S_k|\Phi_0\rangle, \quad (15)$$

and

$$\langle\Phi_{ijk}^a|\bar{H}S_k|\Phi_0\rangle=E_k\langle\Phi_{ijk}^a|S_k|\Phi_0\rangle. \quad (16)$$

It has to be noted that the 3h-1p excitations for the He-like systems are absent, hence only the 2h projections are made in this case after performing the CC calculations. All these equations are expressed in the matrix form as

$$\bar{H}_N\Omega_k=\Omega_k\Delta E_k \quad (17)$$

to solve for the eigenvalues $\Delta E_k=E_k-E_0$, the energy difference between the $|\Psi_0\rangle$ state E_0 and the ionized $|\Psi_k\rangle$ state E_k, and their corresponding eigenvectors by using the normal order Hamiltonian (H_N). The Davidson algorithm [79], which is an iterative diagonalization scheme, is implemented to diagonalize the non-hermitian matrix elements of the effective Hamiltonian $\bar{H}_N$. We have constructed the EOMCC matrix in the opted space but solve only for the principal peaks.



FIG. 1: Trends of IPs and DIPs in the He-like systems as a function of their ionic charge (q).

TABLE I: SCF energy (E^0_{DF}), correlation energies from the MBPT(2) ($E^{(2)}_{corr}$) and CCSD ($E^{(ccsd)}_{corr}$) methods for different systems obtained using our calculations.

System	E^0_{DF}	$E^{(2)}_{corr}$	$E^{(ccsd)}_{corr}$
He	−2.8618	−0.0368	−0.0417
Li^+	−7.2372	−0.0394	−0.0429
Be^{2+}	−13.6139	−0.0406	−0.0434
B^{3+}	−21.9931	−0.0412	−0.0435
C^{4+}	−32.3759	−0.0415	−0.0435
N^{5+}	−44.7641	−0.0416	−0.0434
O^{6+}	−59.1597	−0.0416	−0.0432
F^{7+}	−75.5650	−0.0415	−0.0429
Ne^{8+}	−93.9827	−0.0412	−0.0426
Be	−14.5758	−0.0745	−0.0927
B^+	−24.2451	−0.0856	−0.1091
C^{2+}	−36.4251	−0.0948	−0.1236
N^{3+}	−51.1114	−0.1029	−0.1371
O^{4+}	−68.3143	−0.1104	−0.1500
F^{5+}	−88.0271	−0.1173	−0.1623
Ne^{6+}	−110.2559	−0.1238	−0.1742

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Here, we present and discuss about the numerical results of the calculated IPs and DIPs of the He-like and Be-like systems considering atoms up to Ne using the relativistic EOMCC methods at different levels of approximations. To carry out these calculations, we construct the single particle orbitals in the universal basis (UB) method using GTOs with $\alpha_0 = 0.004$ and $\beta = 2.23$ for all the considered systems. For each of the atomic system, we use 40, 39, 38, 37 and 36 number of GTOs for the s, p, d, f and g symmetry waves in the DF method to obtain the self-consistent field (SCF) solutions for the orbitals. For the EOMCC calculations, we only correlate electrons belonging to the low-lying orbitals up to $16s$, $14p$, $13d$, $11f$ and $10g$ as high-lying orbitals contribute less in the calculations of IPs and DIPs owing to their high energy values. In Table I, we present the SCF (E^0_{DF}) and correlation energies calculated at the the second order perturbation theory approximation (E^2_{corr}) and from the CC method considering only the singles and doubles excitations, which is referred to as CCSD method in the literature, (E^{ccsd}_{corr}).

In Table II, we present IPs of the He-like systems starting from He to Ne. In the same table, we also compare our results with the values listed in the NIST database [78] and the deviations of our results from the NIST values are given in percentage as δ. Three intermediate calculations are also done for the He like ions. In MBPT2-RPA scheme both dynamic and non-dynamic parts of the correlations are missing in comparison to the CCSD-EOMCC method. It is observed that the MBPT2-RPA values are overestimated than CCSD-EOMCC. It is also true for the scheme CCSD-RPA. Missing non-dynamic correlations leads to these overestimations. The MBPT2-EOMCC scheme underestimates the results but these values are in better agreement than the other two scheme in comparison to the experimental values from NIST. It is observed from this table that with increase in the atomic charge, the deviation increases except for He for which it comparatively shows large discrepancy. We attribute the reason for the same as orbitals of the ions are more contracted towards the nucleus than He. Again, increase in discrepancies in ions with higher Z values indicates that contributions from the neglected Breit interaction and quantum electrodynamic (QED) corrections are important to be considered to improve accuracies in these results. Similarly, we present DIPs of the He-like ions in Table III and compare them with the data available in the NIST database. Also, results from our calculations using MBPT2-DIP scheme are presented where the ground state wave function is the first order perturb wave function. In DIP calculations of He like systems the 3h-1p block does not contribute naturally. Deviations of our DIP results of these systems from NIST are given as δ in percentage in the same table. This comparison between the MBPT2-DIP and CCSD-DIP results shows that MBPT2-DIP values are underestimated than the CCSD-DIP values. This study demonstrates that though MBPT2-DIP method constructs the ground state wave function at the first order perturbation level but it gives reasonably accurate results by saving enormous computational time.

In order to assess the trends followed by the calculated results using different employed methods with the ionic charge (q) of the considered atomic systems, we plot the calculated IPs and DIPs of the He-like systems as a

TABLE II: Comparison of our calculated IPs of He-like ions (in eV) with the NIST database. Differences are given as δ in %.

System	MBPT2-RPA	MBPT2-EOMCC	CCSD-RPA	CCSD-EOMCC	NIST [78]	δ
He	25.9828	24.4648	26.1127	24.5850	24.5873	0.009
Li^{+}	77.0651	75.5492	77.1575	75.6379	75.6400	0.002
Be^{2+}	155.3441	153.8286	155.4175	153.9001	153.8961	0.002
B^{3+}	260.8492	259.3337	260.9107	259.3941	259.3715	0.008
C^{4+}	393.6042	392.0884	393.6575	392.1409	392.0905	0.012
N^{5+}	553.6337	552.1174	553.6810	552.1641	552.0673	0.017
O^{6+}	740.9648	739.4476	741.0076	739.4899	739.3267	0.022
F^{7+}	955.6285	954.1102	955.6677	954.1491	953.8980	0.026
Ne^{8+}	1197.6602	1196.1406	1197.6965	1196.1766	1195.8077	0.030

TABLE III: Comparison of DIPs of He-like ions (in eV) from our calculations and IERM method with NIST database. Differences between our values with NIST data are given as δ in %.

System	MBPT2-DIP	CCSD-DIP	NIST [78]	δ
He	78.8769	79.0141	79.0051	0.011
Li^{+}	198.0081	198.1053	198.0935	0.005
Be^{2+}	371.5618	371.6384	371.6152	0.006
B^{3+}	599.5864	599.6502	599.5977	0.008
C^{4+}	882.1263	882.1813	882.0847	0.010
N^{5+}	1219.2303	1219.2788	1219.1142	0.013
O^{6+}	1610.9541	1610.9977	1610.7380	0.016
F^{7+}	2057.3616	2057.4013	2057.0158	0.018
O^{8+}	2558.5256	2558.5621	2558.0076	0.021

function of q as shown in Fig. 1. We found that both the IPs and DIPs follow the standard quadratic equations $aq^2 + bq + c$ with arbitrary parameters a, b and c. It is found that DIPs of He-like ions satisfy the relationship $27q^2 + 92q + 79$ while for the IPs obey $14q^2 + 37q + 25$ trend. The reason for large a coefficient for DIPs may be owing to large kinetic energies of the electrons in the doubly ionized systems than the singly ionized systems. Presence of linear terms in q with different magnitudes of b coefficient for IPs and DIPs correspond to the role of the Coulomb interactions. The larger ratios of b/a and c/b in DIPs imply dominant role by the kinetic energies than the Coulomb interactions in the evaluation of DIPs in the heavier ions.

In Table IV, we tabulate the IP values for both the $1s$ and $2s$ orbitals of the considered Be-like ions. The results of the $2s$ orbitals are compared with the NIST values and the deviations, given in percentage as δ from the NIST values, are found to be very small. The DIP values are given in Table V and are compared with the NIST data. As can be seen, we have achieved accuracies of less than $\sim 0.01\%$ for all the Be-like systems. For Ne^{6+}, the absolute value differs by 0.04 eV and for the rest it is only about 0.01 eV. For Be like systems we also present intermediate results using MBPT2-RPA, MBPT2-EOMCC and CCSD-RPA schemes. It has been observed that the RPA values are overestimated than the CCSD-EOMCC results. On the other hand MBPT2-EOMCC values are



FIG. 2: Trends of IP values in the Be-like systems as a function of ionic charge (q).

lower than the CCSD-EOMCC values. The differences between the results from these two schemes are more for the 2s orbitals where as less for the 1s orbitals.

In Fig. 2, we plot the IP values of the inner $1s$ electron of Be-like ions against their corresponding q values and find also a parabolic behavior with a coefficient having same value as of the plot for the IPs of the He-like ions. However, since the Coulomb potentials are larger in the Be-like systems for which its b coefficient found to be larger. In the same figure, we also give plot for IPs of the outer $2s$ electrons from the respective Be-like systems and find again a parabolic trend but with much smaller a, b and c coefficients. This may be due to the the fact that the outer $2s$ electrons are loosely bound with their nucleus. Similarly, we plot the DIPs of Be-like systems for both the $1s$ and $2s$ orbital electrons in Fig. 3. We see like-wise plots with Fig. 2 and find for the $1s$ orbital electrons it follows the relationship $27q^2 + 180q + 310$ while for the $2s$ orbital electrons it obeys $6.8q^2 + 29q +$

TABLE IV: Comparison of our calculated IPs of Be-like ions (in eV) with the NIST database. Differences are given as δ in %.

System	MBPT2-RPA		MBPT2-EOMCC		CCSD-RPA		CCSD-EOMCC		NIST [78]	δ
	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$2s$	
Be	129.9469	9.3047	124.7181	8.9465	129.7176	9.6607	124.6451	9.3252	9.3226	0.028
B^{+}	223.9840	24.9441	218.8594	24.6074	223.7854	25.4713	218.7644	25.1534	25.1548	0.005
C^{2+}	345.5711	47.5097	340.6506	47.1797	345.3836	48.1981	340.5585	47.8859	47.8877	0.003
N^{3+}	494.5523	76.9378	489.5203	76.6103	494.3698	77.7834	489.3986	77.4733	77.4735	∼0.000
O^{4+}	670.8905	113.2110	665.8323	112.8843	670.7105	114.2119	665.6995	113.9024	113.8989	0.003
F^{5+}	874.5887	156.3277	869.6562	156.0011	874.4103	157.4820	869.5240	157.1727	157.1631	0.006
Ne^{6+}	1105.6664	206.2915	1100.7049	205.9644	1105.4891	207.5978	1100.5646	207.2880	207.2710	0.008

TABLE V: Comparison of our calculated DIPs of Be-like ions (in eV) with the NIST database. Differences are given as δ in %.

System	MBPT2-RPA		MBPT2-EOMCC		CCSD-RPA		CCSD-EOMCC		NIST [78]	δ
	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$1s$	$2s$	$2s$	
Be	321.0077	27.1344	308.5294	27.0969	320.4761	27.5600	308.3921	27.5427	27.5338	0.032
B^{+}	526.2121	62.5409	513.4659	62.4882	525.7490	63.1252	513.2750	63.0833	63.0869	0.005
C^{2+}	786.4974	111.6955	773.6588	111.6329	786.0613	112.4343	773.4375	112.3789	112.3803	0.001
N^{3+}	1101.5640	174.5374	1088.4372	174.4678	1101.1411	175.4290	1088.1864	175.3649	175.3638	∼0.000
O^{4+}	1471.3467	251.0545	1458.4205	250.9797	1470.9312	252.0981	1458.2743	252.0278	252.0183	0.003
F^{5+}	1895.8582	341.2520	1882.5409	341.1733	1895.4476	342.4468	1882.2607	342.3718	342.3493	0.006
Ne^{6+}	2375.1422	445.1430	2361.6537	445.0611	2374.7351	446.4879	2361.3575	446.4093	446.3676	0.009



FIG. 3: Trends of DIP values in the Be-like systems as a function of ionic charge (q).

28 relation with their ionic charges. These coefficients are almost twice than that of their corresponding IPs. Again, when we compare trends of DIPs of the $1s$ orbital electrons of Be-like ions with the He-like ions, we find the corresponding a coefficient is same but the b coefficient value is large.

V. CONCLUSION

We have developed and applied four-component EOM methods at different levels of approximations to evaluate IPs and DIPs of the He-like and Be-like isoelectronic sequences up to Ne. Comparison between our results with the NIST database shows that EOMCC results are in very good agreement with the values tabulated in NIST database. It has been demonstrated that both IPs and DIPs of He-like and Be-like isoelectronic sequences follow parabolic trends and the magnitudes of the coefficients of the parabolas are attributed to the role of the kinetic energies and Coulomb interactions of the systems. These coefficients for the $1s$ orbital electrons are almost twice compared to the $2s$ orbital electrons in the Be-like systems. Excellent agreement of our calculated results with the NIST values implies that our EOMCC method is capable of accounting for both the relativistic and electron correlation effects accurately. Observation of slight deviations in the values for heavier ions imply that inclusion of higher order relativistic corrections may be required to improve accuracies of those results.

Acknowledgment

H.P., T.S., N.V. and S.P. acknowledge a grant from CSIR XIIth Five Year Plan project on Multi-Scale Simu-

lations of Material (MSM) and the resources of the Center of Excellence in Scientific Computing at CSIR-NCL. H.P. acknowledge the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) for fellowship. S.P. acknowledges the award of the J. C. Bose Fellowship from DST. B.K.S acknowledges 3TFlop HPC cluster at Physical Research Laboratory for part of the calculations.

[1] Eland J H D, Vieuxmaire O, Kinugawa T, Lablanquie P, Hall R I and Penent F 2003 *Phys Rev Lett* **90** 053003
[2] Eland J H D, Ho S S W and Worthington H L 2003 *Chem Phys* **290** 27
[3] Ackermann W et al 2007 *Nat Photonics* **1** 336
[4] Rohringer N et al 2012 *Nature*(London) **481** 488
[5] Gillaspy J D 2001 *J Phys B* **34** R93
[6] Chutjian A 2003 *The Physics of Multiply and Highly Charged Ions* edited by F J Currell (Kluwer, London)
[7] McLaughlin B M 2013 *J Phys B* **46** 075204
[8] Nicastro F, Smita M, Elvis M, Drake J, Taotao F, Antonella F, Yair K, Hermann M, Rik W and Andreas Z 2005 *Nature* **433** 495
[9] Zappacosta L, Nicastro F, Kronggold Y and Maiolino R 2012 *Astrophys J* **753** 137
[10] Grant I P 2010 *Relativistic Quantum Theory of Atoms and Molecules: Theory and Computation* (Springer, New York)
[11] Seakins M, Griffiths W J, Harris F M, Andrews S R and Parry D E 1993 *Org Mass Spectr* **28** 1144
[12] Eliav E, Kaldor U, and Ishikawa Y 1994 *Phys Rev A* **49** 1724
[13] Eliav E, Kaldor U, and Ishikawa Y 1994 *Phys Rev A* **50** 1121
[14] Visscher L, Eliav E, and Kaldor U 2001 *J. Chem. Phys* **115** 9720
[15] Ilyabaev E and Kaldor U 1992 *Chem Phys Letters* **194** 95
[16] Ilyabaev E and Kaldor U 1992 *J Chem Phys* **97** 8455
[17] Ilyabaev E and Kaldor U 1993 *Phys Rev A* **47** 137
[18] Pathak H, Sasmal S, Nayak M K, Vaval N, and Pal S 2014 *Phys Rev A* **90** 062501
[19] Lindgren I *Int J Quantum Chem* 1978 **14** 33
[20] Haque M and Mukherjee D 1984 *J Chem Phys* **80** 5058
[21] Stolarczyk L Z and Monkhorst H J 1985 *Phys Rev A* **32** 725
[22] Pal S, Rittby M, Bartlett R J, Sinha D, and Mukherjee D 1987 *Chem Phys Lett* **137** 273
[23] Mukherjee D and Lindgren I 1987 *Phys Rep* **151** 93
[24] Pal S, Rittby M, Bartlett R J, Sinha D, and Mukherjee D 1988 *J Chem Phys* **88** 4357
[25] Jeziorski B and Paldus J 1989 *J Chem Phys* **90** 2714
[26] Mukherjee D and Pal S 1989 *Adv Quantum Chem* **20** 291
[27] Schucan T H and Weidenmuller H A 1972 *Ann Phys* **73** 108
[28] Schucan T H and Weidenmuller H A 1973 *Ann Phys* **76** 483
[29] Baker H, Robb M A, and Slattery Z 1981 *Mol Phys* **44** 1035
[30] Salomonsen S, Lindgren I, and Martensson A M 1980 *Phys Scr* **21** 351
[31] Kaldor U 1988 *Phys Rev A* **38** 6013
[32] Malrieu J P, Durand Ph, and Daudey J P 1985 *J Phys A* **18** 809
[33] Meissner L, *J Chem Phys* 1998 **108** 9227
[34] Musial M, Meissner L, Kucharski S A, and Bartlett R J 2005 *J Chem Phys* **122**, 224110
[35] Meissner L and Nooijen M 1995 *J Chem Phys* **102** 9604
[36] Meissner L and Malinowski P 2000 *Phys Rev A* **61** 062510
[37] Musial M and Bartlett R J 2008 *Chem Phys Lett* **457** 267
[38] Landau A, Eliav E, and Kaldor U 1999 *Chem Phys Lett* **313** 399
[39] Landau A, Eliav E, and Kaldor U 2001 *Adv Quantum Chem* **39** 171
[40] Sinha D, Mukhopadhyay S, Chaudhuri R, and Mukherjee D 1989 *Chem Phys Lett* **154** 544
[41] Chattopadhyay S, Mitra A, Sinha D 2006 *J Chem Phys* **125** 244111
[42] Pathak H, Sahoo B K, Das B P, Vaval N and Pal S 2014 *Phys Rev A* **89** 042510
[43] Nandy D K, Singh Y and Sahoo B K 2014 *Phys Rev A* **89** 062509
[44] Pathak H, Ghosh A, Sahoo B K, Das B P, Vaval N and Pal S 2014 *Phys Rev A* **90** 010501(R)
[45] Sekino H and Bartlett R J 1984 *Int J Quantum Chem* **26** 255
[46] Bartlett R J and Stanton J F 1994 *Reviews in Computational Chemistry* edited by K B Lipkowitz and D B Boyd **5** (VCH, New York) pp 65
[47] Stanton J F and Bartlett R J 1993 *J Chem Phys* **98** 7029
[48] Bartlett R J 2012 *Comput Mol Sci* **2** 126
[49] Musiał M, Kucharski S A and Bartlett R J 2003 *J Chem Phys* **118** 1128
[50] Musiał M and Bartlett R J 2003 *J Chem Phys* **119** 1901
[51] Musiał M, Perera A and Bartlett R J 2011 *J Chem Phys* **134** 114108
[52] Meissner L, Bartlett R J 1995 *J Chem Phys* **102** 7490
[53] Nooijen M and Bartlett R J 1995 *J Chem Phys* **102** 3629
[54] Mukhopadhyay S Kr, Choudhuri R, Mukhopadhyay D Jr, Mukherjee D 1990 *Chem Phys Lett* **173** 181
[55] Mukhopadhyay D, Mukhopadhyay S K, Choudhuri R, and Mukherjee D 1991 *Theor Chim Acta* **80** 441
[56] Tomasz Kuś and Anna I. Krylov 2011 *J Chem Phys* **135** 084109
[57] Jun Shen and Piotr Piecuch 2013 *J Chem Phys* **138** 194102
[58] Musiał M, Perera A, Bartlett R J 134 *J Chem Phys* **134** 114108
[59] Lindenberg J and Öhrn Y 1973 *Propagators in Quantum Chemistry* (Academic, New York)
[60] Cederbaum L S and Domcke W 1977 *Adv Chem Phys* **36** 205
[61] Monkhorst H J 1977 *Int J Quantum Chem* **12** 421
[62] Dalgaard E, Monkhorst H J 1983 *Phys Rev A* **28** 1217
[63] Koch H, Jörgensen P 1990 *J Chem Phys* **93** 3333
[64] Koch H, Jensen H A, Jörgensen P and Helgaker 1993 *J Chem Phys* **93** 3345
[65] Mukherjee D and Mukherjee P K 1979 *Chem Phys* **39** 325

[66] Koch H, Kobayashi R, deMeras A S, Jörgensen P 1994 *J Chem Phys* **100** 4393
[67] Kobayashi R, Koch H, Jörgensen P 1994 *Chem Phys Lett* **219** 30
[68] Sekino H and Bartlett R J 1994 *Chem Phys Lett* **225** 486
[69] Chaudhuri R K, Panda P K, Das B P, Mahapatra U S, Mukherjee D 1999 *Phys Rev A* **60** 246
[70] Chaudhuri R K, Panda P K, Merlitz H, Das B P, Mahapatra U S and Mukherjee D 2000 *J Phys B* **33** 5129
[71] Das M, Chaudhuri R K, Chattopadhyay S, Mahapatra U S and Mukherjee P K 2011 *J Phys B* **44** 165701
[72] Chaudhuri R, Datta B, Das K and Mukherjee D 1996 *Int J Quantum Chem* **60** 347
[73] Choudhuri R, Chattopadhyay S, Mahapatra U S 2013 *J Phys Chem A* **117** 12616
[74] Chaudhuri R K, Chattopadhyay S, Mahapatra U S 2012 *Physics of plasmas* **19** 082701
[75] Nakatsuji H 1978 *Chem Phys Lett* **59** 362
[76] Nakatsuji H Hirao K 1978 *J Chem Phys* **68** 2053
[77] Nakatsuji H 1979 *Chem Phys Lett* **67** 329
[78] http://physics.nist.gov/PhysRefData/ASD/ionEnergy.html
[79] Davidson E R 1975 *J Comput Phys* **17** 87